

Dated: 03/08/01

Subject: Addendum No. 01 to Request for Proposal (RFP) No. JPL-MSR-2001 dated March 5, 2001 for Mars Sample Return Technical Approach Study, Questions/Clarification Request

The following questions were received for the subject RFP No. JPL-MSR-2001. JPL's responses to these questions are submitted below:

Question No. 1:

1. Volume II, Cost Instructions, Paragraph 3, Page 12, "Indirect Costs" - The RFP states "Does not apply if your Indirect Rates have been approved by DCAA." Does the word "approved," as used in the RFP mean indirect rates which have been included in a Forward Pricing Rate Proposal (FPRP), which has been given to the on-site cognizant DCAA and DCMA heads and approved for use in proposals, or must the FPRP indirect rates be negotiated with the cognizant ACO in order to be considered "approved"?

Answer to Question No. 1:

Even if the Forward Pricing Rate Proposal has been given to the on-site DCAA and DCMA heads, and the rates have been approved for use in proposals, this does not mean that these rates have been approved. If your direct and indirect rates have not been approved by DCAA, you will need to notify us and discuss the development of these rates under paragraph 3.5.1 of Volume II of the Cost Instructions.

Question No. 2:

2. General Instructions, Paragraph 2.0, "Proposal Format", Page 2 and General Instructions, Paragraph 4.0, "Submitting Your Proposal", Page 2 – Request clarification with regard to the format to be utilized for "Volume II – Cost Instructions" and "Volume III – Past Performance". Offerors are not required to submit Volumes II and III in viewgraph format, only Volume I must be in viewgraph format. Correct?

Answer to Question No. 2:

Your are correct. Volumes II and III, Cost Instructions and Past Performance, respectively, are not required in viewgraph format. However, your viewgraph format for Volume I - Technical/Management Instructions should show a corelation between the Cost Instructions and the Past Performance Volumes.

Question No. 3:

3. General Instructions, Paragraph 4.2, "Address and Identification", Page 4 – We are unable to locate the Attachment I to the RFP cover letter, which contains the

address label to be utilized on the proposal. Will the label be added to the JPL web-site soon?

Answer to Question No. 3:

A label will be added to the JPL Web site after the RFP cover letter.

Question No. 4:

4. General Instructions, Paragraph 7.1, “Financial Statement”, Page 13 – May a very large publicly traded company, with known financial stability, submit the Annual Shareholders’ Report from the last three years or Quarterly Earnings Statements for the last three years or refer JPL personnel to an external web site containing the desired information in fulfillment of this requirement?

Answer to Question No. 4:

Your companies annual Shareholders’ Report and any other pertinent data will satisfy this requirement for paragraph 7.1 under the General Instructions.

Question No. 5:

5. Specimen Contract - Does JPL want the Specimen Contract TBDs to be filled in by the Offerors and returned in the “Volume II, Cost Instructions” portion of the proposal?

Answer to Question No. 5:

Any TBDs in the Specimen Contract are to be filled in by JPL.

Question No. 6:

6. Specimen Contract, Article 2, “Price and Payment”, Paragraph 2.0 “Minimum Level of Effort” – The intent of paragraph 2.0 is unclear. It could be interpreted to benefit those Offerors which have support function employees which charge into indirect charge numbers, as opposed to direct charging support function employees. The use of the language “Engineering effort” and “Engineering hours” is where the confusion arises. Due to the difference in rate structures found between different companies, it is unclear if those companies whose support functions must charge direct would then be penalized since fewer “Engineering hours” would be provided to JPL. Or perhaps it is only trying to say that a minimum amount of hours must be expended and that the Offeror must be able to verify that the hours were in fact expended. The hours would be based on a wrap rate that includes required support function labor, as well as engineering labor, in the wrap rate, even though the Offeror may provide a labor category breakdown, and the hours associated with each labor category, in the pricing backup.

Answer to No. 6:

The intent of this paragraph 2.0 is to verify that the selected Offeror has expended the minimum amount of hours for this effort, and the Offeror must be able to verify that the hours were in fact expended. This information will be based on the information that is received in your Cost Instructions Proposal.

Question No. 7:

7. Attachment A-3, "Government Property" – If the Offeror only requires the use of non-classified Government Furnished Information (GFI) or Government Furnished Data (as it may be known to NASA personnel) it is assumed that a letter from the cognizant Contracting Officer approving its use will not be required to be submitted with the proposal or at any later date. Is this correct? The Offeror need only identify the GFI in response to Paragraph B, subparagraphs 2 (a) and (b) of Attachment A-3. Is this correct?

Answer to Question No. 7:

JPL does not anticipate the use of Government Property for this effort. Therefore, you are only required to fill-out paragraphs B.1.a and B. 2.a. on Attachment A-3.